APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/864,783	05/24/2001	Indra Laksono	VIXS 006	8015

34280   7590   01/11/2008
TIMOTHY W. MARKISON
VIXS, INC.
P.O.BOX 160727
AUSTIN, TX 78736

EXAMINER
BROWN, RUEBEN M

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2623	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
01/11/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

-- *The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address* --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>24 October 2007</u>.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.　　　2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-15 and 34-56</u> is/are pending in the application.

　　4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) _____ is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) <u>1-15 & 34-56</u> is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

　　Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

　　Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

　　a)☐ All　b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

　　　1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

　　　2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

　　　3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

　　* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
　　Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
　　Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1.   A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in

37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is

eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e)

has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to

37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 10/24/2007 has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in
> section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are
> such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person
> having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the
> manner in which the invention was made.

3.   Claims 1-3, 10-14, 42-44, & 51-55 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Hamlin, (U.S. Pat # 5,574,964), in view of Hicks, (U.S. PG-PUB

2004/0255326).

Considering claims 1 & 42, Hamlin teaches a system wherein a converter 34, receives a

plurality of media signals 22 from a plurality of different sources and provides them over a

plurality of TV channels from which the user is enabled to choose a particular desired channel,

(Fig. 1; col. 2, lines 54-67 thru col. 3, lines 1-52).

The amended claimed, 'method for isolating a channel of interest from a set of channels

from a plurality of multimedia sources that include a video network in a multimedia system that

includes a multimedia server that is coupled to the plurality of multimedia sources', reads on the

disclosure of Hamlin (col. 6, lines 17-45). In particular, the interface pod 44 selects the

appropriate channel that is directed to it, based on the information in the control signal 82

transmitted from the system controller 38. The converter 34, in conjunction with the system

controller 38 meets the claimed multimedia server.

'receiving the set of channels as a stream of data', reads on the range of video

programming continuously transmitted on the common bus 36 as a common bus signal 80, (col.

3, lines 12-17; col. 6, lines 34-39; col. 6, lines 51-65; col. 7, lines 3-7. The common bus signal is

a broadband of channels, meets the claimed 'set of channels', see Fig. 5; col. 4, lines 52-67.

'interpreting segments of the stream of data to identify data of the channel of interest',

'interpreting the data of the channel of interest to determine the type of data' is also met by the

disclosure in Hamlin, col. 8, lines 35-40; col. 9, lines 1-30 & col. 11, lines 15-35, which

discloses that when a subscriber makes selection of a particular program, that the interface pod

44 identifies the appropriate channel from the common bus signal 80, and transmits the instant

channel to the appropriate receiving unit 46.

'processing the data of the channel of interest based on the type of data to produce

processed data' and 'providing the processed data for display' is also met by interface pod 44

Hamlin providing requested video data to a receiving unit 46, see col. 4, lines 27-52; Fig. 4.

As for the claimed feature of, '…from a plurality of multimedia sources that include …a

local media player, wherein at least one of the set of channels includes data from a local media

player', even though Hamlin teaches that the common bus signal 80 transmits a range of

programming from to the plurality of pods 44, the reference does not explicitly discuss that one

of the sources may be from a local source. Nevertheless Hicks, which is in the same field of

endeavor of distribution of programming within a home network, provides a teaching of a

broadband multimedia gateway BMG 100 that receives programming from a plurality of

different sources, such as CATV, satellite TV, terrestrial broadcast, etc., as well a mass storage

device 103/110 that can store video programming received from one of the plurality of sources,

Para [0041,0047,0049]. Once stored in the device 103/110, the video programming can then be

distributed to one or more of the customer's reception device(s), see Para [0054,0057,0064-0072]. Therefore the mass storage device 103 of Hicks, reads on the claimed local media player. It would have been obvious for one ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to modify Hamlin with the technology of providing customers with a local memory which can store programming for redistribution, at least for the desirable advantage of allowing the customer to access the programming whenever desired, as taught by Hicks, without requiring an upstream signal to the CATV headend.

Considering claims 2-3 & 43-44, Hamlin teaches that the control signal 82, includes interface pod address 84 and the interface command 86, which meets the claimed subject matter, see Fig. 5; col. 6, lines 24-45.

Considering claims 10-11 & 51-52, the claimed subject matter reads on the disclosure in Hicks of storing certain programming on the storage device 103/110, for subsequent retrieval by the customer.

Considering claims 12 & 53 the data stream on the common bus 36 in Hamlin includes frame headers and frame payload, and interpreting the frame header to determinate data of the channel of interests, see col. 11, lines 22-35, which discusses that a variety of information including header, are used to reconstruct frames of data. Also see Fig. 5, which discloses the framing structure.

Considering claims 13 & 54, see Hamlin, col. 5, lines 34-46 & col. 6, lines 7-17.

Considering claims 14 & 55, the subject matter is met by the combination of Hamlin & Hicks.

4.   Claims 4-5 & 45-46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hamlin & Hicks, in view of Mills, (U.S. Pat # 6,311,204).

Considering claims 4-5 & 45-46, Hamlin teaches that the received data is processed before being displayed, but does not disclose the feature of converting YUV data and RGB data. Nevertheless Mills, which is in the same field of endeavor, teaches a decoder system that receives MPEG video data (col. 9, lines 35-55) and converts RGB data to YUV data, col. 13, lines 30-55. It would have been obvious for one ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to modify Hamlin with the feature of converting RGB to YUV data, at least for the purpose of enabling a particular interpolation and blending process, as taught by Mills, col. 2, lines 18-40.

5.   Claims 6-7 & 47-48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hamlin, Hicks & Mills as applied to claim 4 above, and further in view of Leone, (U.S. Pat # 6,901,153).

Considering claims 6 & 47, Hamlin & Mills do not discuss the claimed feature of

'Huffman decoding' or 'de-zigzagging the Huffman decoded data to produce the de-zz data' and

''de-quantizing the de-zz data to produce de-Q data'. However, Leone which is in the same field

of endeavor of decoding compressed MPEG data, teaches Huffman decoded video data, which

is de-zigzagged and de-quantized, see col. 2, lines 25-36. It would have been obvious for one

ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to modify Hamlin with the feature of

Huffman decoding, de-zigzagging and de-quantizing video data, for the improvement of

providing a more precisely processed video stream, as taught by Leone. Leone specifically

teaches that de-quantizing the data and de-zigzagging the data, removes the diagonal pixel

ordering used by the MPEG to improve the run length processing.

Leone also teaches the claimed, 'performing IDCT upon the de-Q data' and 'motion

compensation and scaling', see col. 2, lines 30-38 & col. 2, lines 60-67.

Considering claims 7 & 48, Leone teaches converting the YUV to RGB data, see col. 2,

lines 50-67.

6.   Claims 8-9 & 49-50 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Hamlin & Hicks as applied to claims 3 & 44 above, and further in view of Sueyoshi, (U.S. Pat #

6,295,319).

Considering claims 8-9 & 49-50, even though Hamlin teaches determining the type of

data, such as audio or video, by looking at the PID, the reference does not discuss converting the

audio into PCM. Nevertheless, Sueyoshi teaches converting the audio MPEG data in to PCM and

holding in a buffer, see col. 4, lines 55-61; col. 5, lines 6-15 & col. 7, lines 37-67. It would have

Hamlin with the feature of converting audio data to PCM as taught by Sueyoshi, for the desirable

improvement of a standard audio decoding algorithm that provides and enhanced sound

production.

7.   Claims 15 & 56 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hamlin,

in view of Tsuge, (U.S. Pat # 5,995,709).

Considering claims 15 & 56, even though Hamlin teaches decoding a video stream, the

reference does not teach specifics of at least one of: multilevel coding/decoding, non-return-to-

zero coding/decoding, block coding/decoding, and nB/m coding/decoding of data streams.

However Tsuge, which is in the same field of endeavor, provides a teaching of non-return to zero

(NRZ) conversion, Abstract; col. 7, lines 41-67 thru col. 8, lines 1-21. Tsuge is particularly

compatible with the Hamlin, which includes an MPEG demux 127 and decoders 129,131 (Fig. 4)

for decoding an MPEG stream; since Tsuge is also directed to decoding data included in an

MPEG data stream, (NRZ modulated pixel data, which may contain closed caption data), see col.

2, lines 1-25. It would have been obvious for one ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made, to modify Hamlin with the features of non-return to zero coding/decoding,

at least for the desirable advantage of transmitting text code as NRZ modulated signals, as taught

Tsuge, col. 1, lines 15-55.

8.   Claims 34-37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hylton,

(U.S. Pat # 5,708,961), in view of Hamlin, (U.S. Pat # 5,574,964).

Considering claim 34, the claimed client module for use in a multimedia system that

includes a multimedia server that is coupled to a plurality of multimedia sources including a

video network and the Internet, reads on the combination of Hylton & Hamlin; Fig. 1; col. 5,

lines 30-67 thru col. 6, lines 1-67), which comprises:

'a network interface controller operably coupled to receive encoded channel data that

represents a set of channels via a communication path from the multimedia server, the set of

channels including at least one channel for providing a user with bidirectional access to the

Internet, such that the NIC extracts data relating to a channel of interest from the encoded

channel data', even though Hylton discloses that video programming may be transmitted to TIM

101, the reference does not explicitly discuss that a channel carrying Internet data may also be

transmitted. However, Hamlin provides a teaching of a home video network wherein a plurality

of multimedia sources are delivered to the set top 100, including Internet data, by the operation

of the interface pod 44, previously discussed above with respect claims 1 & 42, col. 6, lines 25-

45. The NIC also corresponds with the operation of the interface pod 44. The claimed

'multimedia server', corresponds with the converter 34 and controller 38, Fig. 1. It would have

been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to modify

Hylton with the feature of providing a Internet channel to a customer, at least for the desirable

benefit of allowing the user the convenience to accessing their financial accounts, as taught by

Hamlin, col. 5, lines 65-67 thru col. 6, lines 1-8.

'video decoder to decode the data relating to the channel of interest to produce decoded

data', is met by the operation of the video decoder 129, of Hylton, see col. 9, lines 1-25 & col.

14, lines 30-67 thru col. 15, lines 1-35; Fig. 4.

'memory operably coupled to store the decoded video data', reads on the video RAM 4

of Hylton; col. 15, lines 1-15.

'rendering module' reads on the encoder 137, (Fig. 4; col. 16, lines 8-20).

Considering claims 35-36, see col. 14, lines 20-67, Hylton, which discloses the TV 103.

Considering claim 37, the NIC reads on the TIM 101 of Hylton, see col. 8, lines 1-45.

9.   Claims 38-39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hylton &

Hamlin, in view of Chimoto, (U.S. Pat # 5,838,383).

Considering claims 38 & 39, Hylton or Hamlin do not discuss a microphone or video

camera, local to the user DET system 102. Nevertheless, Chimoto discloses a local entertainment

system that includes a video camera 435 & microphone 437, (Fig. 4; col. 15, lines 30-32; col. 21,

lines 21-28). It would have been obvious for one ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention

was made, to modify the combination of Hylton & Hamlin with the well-known technology of a

local video camera and microphone, as taught by Chimoto, at least for the desirable benefit of

providing the user with the option of two-way video communication, such as in a video

conference, using the entertainment equipment already provided.

Chimoto discloses A/D converter sections 434, 436 for converting the inputs from

camera 435 & microphone 437, in to digital signals; see col. 15, lines 30-38.

10.   Claim 40 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hylton &

Hamlin, in view of Arai, (U.S. Pat # 7,068,677).

Considering claim 40, Hylton does not teach transmitting packets in the wireless network

using CSMA technology. Nevertheless, Arai is directed to a radio LAN that uses CSMA

technology, Abstract; col. 2, lines 50-61. Arai goes on teach transmitting IP packets in the

system and using the CSMA technology, see col. 5, lines 22-35. It would have been obvious for

one ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to modify Hylton with the

technique of CSMA for detecting LAN data, including IP data, as taught by Arai, for the benefit

of using the known reliability of CSMA over a radio LAN system, overcoming the problem

using a radio LAN over long distance, see col. 1, lines 49-67 thru col. 2, lines 1-20.

11.   Claim 41 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hylton &

Hamlin, in view of Leone.

        Considering claim 41, Hylton does not discuss the claimed feature of 'Huffman

decoding' or 'de-zigzagging the Huffman decoded data to produce the de-zz data' and ''de-

quantizing the de-zz data to produce de-Q data'. However, Leone which is in the same field of

endeavor of decoding compressed MPEG data, teaches Huffman decoded video data, which his

de-zigzagged and de-quantized, see col. 2, lines 25-36. It would have been obvious for one

ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to modify Hamlin with the feature of

Huffman decoding, de-zigzagging and de-quantizing video data, for the improvement of

providing a more precisely processed video stream, as taught by Leone. Leone specifically

teaches that de-quantizing the data and de-zigzagging the data, removes the diagonal pixel

ordering used by the MPEG to improve the run length processing.

Leone also teaches the claimed, 'performing IDCT upon the de-Q data' and 'motion

compensation and scaling', see col. 2, lines 30-38 & col. 2, lines 60-67.

Conclusion

12.   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's

disclosure.

A)   Yokota   Teaches a home distribution network that also includes local media player.

B)   Vasilevsky   Provides a home network that also distributes Internet data to the

customers.

Application/Control Number: 09/864,783

Art Unit: 2623

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

or faxed to:
(571) 273-8300, (for formal communications intended for entry)
Or:
(571) 273-7290 (for informal or draft communications, please label "PROPOSED" or "DRAFT")

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Reuben M. Brown M. Brown whose telephone number is (571) 272-7290. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F(8:30-6:00), First Friday off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Christopher Kelley can be reached on (571) 272-7331. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300 for regular communications and After Final communications.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Reuben M. Brown